

Remarks/Arguments:

The applicant would like to thank the examiner for the telephonic interview on September 9, 2008, in which the claims and the specification were discussed. The claims have been amended to focus more on the application server as part of the invention.

The above Amendments and these Remarks are in reply to the Office Action mailed July 24, 2008.

Claims 1-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 as being directed to non-statutory subject matter.

Claims 1 and 11 have been amended to add the feature which “the extensible administration tool runs on at least one processor” and for that reason, these claims are believed to be statutory.

Claims 1-3, 5-13, 15-19, 20, 22-27, 28, 30-34, 35 and 37-41 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wiegel (US Patent No. 6,484,261) in view of Freeman et al (U.S. Publication No. 2002/0002613).

Claims 4, 14, 21, 29 and 36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wiegel, in view of Freeman et al and in further view of Zellweger (U.S. Patent No. 6,397,222).

Claims 1, 11, 20, 28 and 35 have been amended to add the features that the application server is adapted to host application and that “the console extension adds the at least one control panel and adds navigation elements that appear along with default supplied system screens, the console extension allowing for custom management of applications deployed onto the application server”. For this reason, these claims are believed to be allowable over the cited prior art.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any underpayment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 06-1325 for any matter in connection with this response, including any fee for extension of time, which may be required.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: September 17, 2008

By: /Joseph P. O'Malley/
Joseph P. O'Malley
Reg. No. 36,226

Customer No. 80548
FLIESLER MEYER LLP
650 California Street, 14th Floor
San Francisco, California 94108
Telephone: (415) 362-3800